

Attorney Docket: 25090A

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to remove new matter, as requested by the Examiner in the Official Letter. Twenty-five (25) claims are pending and remain for consideration.

IN THE SPECIFICATION

In the Official Letter, dated January 19, 2005, the Examiner indicated that a reference to a related application was not recited on page 1 of the specification (see paragraph 3, page 2 of the Official Letter).

In a response dated April 21, 2005, Applicants amended the specification to make reference to a related application. In the Official Letter, dated June 28, 2005, the Examiner objected to the specification under 35 U.S.C. §132(a), stating that, in the paragraph under the heading CROSS REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS, the clause "the description of which is incorporated herein by reference" introduced new matter.

In a brief telephone conversation on September 9, 2005, between Examiner Mark Halpren and Applicants' representative, Thedford I. Hitaffer, the Examiner indicated that the objection to the specification was specifically limited to the clause "the description of which is incorporated herein by reference," and that the objection could be overcome by deleting the clause accordingly. The clause has been so deleted.

IN THE CLAIMS35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-18 and 27-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for the same reason as set forth immediately above. The specification has been amended to overcome the rejection.

Attorney Docket: 25090A

Art Rejections

In the Official Letter, dated January 19, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 10, 15, and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Pflugl and/or Bly, claims 8, 9, 11-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Pflugl in view of Bly and/or Hoke.

In the amendment filed on April 21, 2005, in response to the Official Letter, Applicants' amended claims 1, 12 and 15, cancelled claims 19-26, and added new claims 27-33, which the Examiner acknowledged on page 2, paragraph 1, in the Official Letter, dated June 28, 2005. However, following his acknowledgement of the amendment, the Examiner merely stated that if Applicants deleted the new matter mentioned above, the previous rejection with regard to claim 1-18 still applied. The Official Letter is totally void any discussion about the merits of the new claims, claims 27-33.

In Applicants' amendment filed on April 21, 2005, Applicants provided five pages of remarks and/or arguments in support of the amended claims and new claims being in condition for allowance. The Examiner has failed to move the prosecution forward by responding to Applicants' remarks and arguments and by addressing the merits of claims 27-33.

Applicants believe the claims are presently in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner either move the prosecution forward by either addressing Application remarks and arguments and rejecting the new claims on prior art, or withdraw his rejection of the claims and pass the claims on for allowance.